Title
Competence, Communicative and Linguistic

Your Name Emilee Moore
Affiliation Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Email Address emilee.moore@uab.cat

Word Count
1487

Abstract
The notion of communicative competence, proposed by Dell Hymes, emerged in reaction to the concept of linguistic competence put forward by Noam Chomsky. Chomsky distinguished between linguistic performance, or actual language use in context, and linguistic competence, or innate language knowledge. He claimed that only the latter was worthy of scientific attention. Hymes refuted this distinction and the disregard for performance, proposing instead a theory of communicative competence that sought to explain the rules underlying people's contextually appropriate language use. More recently the notion of communicative competence has been extended in research on interactional competence.

Keywords
[Linguistic competence, communicative competence, interactional competence, competence, performance]

Main Text

The notion of communicative competence, first proposed by linguistic anthropologist Dell Hymes, emerged in reaction to the concept of linguistic competence put forward by cognitive linguist Noam Chomsky. Chomsky distinguished between linguistic performance, or actual language use in context, and linguistic competence, or innate language knowledge. He claimed that only the latter was worthy of scientific attention. Hymes refuted this distinction and the disregard for performance, proposing instead a theory of communicative competence that sought to explain the rules underlying people's contextually appropriate language use.

Noam Chomsky's (1965) work on linguistic competence developed from his critique of radical behaviorism, represented by the work of psychologist Burrhus Frederic Skinner. Behaviorism conceptualizes individuals' behavior, including their language learning and use, to be conditioned by observable processes of stimulus, response, learning history (repetition), and reinforcement –of habit formation. For behaviorists, allusions to psychological or cognitive activities had no place in scientific theory. Chomsky argued that behaviorist accounts of language learning and use were insufficient –for example for explaining the fact that young children rapidly employ language to which they have never been exposed. Thus humans' language behavior and behavioral capacities must exceed the limits of the process posited by behaviorists.

Chomsky argued that language learning and use could not be explained by the passive formation of habits, but rather people actively formulate linguistic norms from infancy thanks to an innate universal grammar that allows for infinite linguistic possibilities, activated by exposure to language. Linguistic competence refers to this intrinsic grammatical system that allows people to produce endless grammatical sentences and to distinguish between what is grammatically correct or not. According to Chomsky, the benchmark of linguistic competence is that of the ideal native speaker of a given language –that is, of the expert monolingual speaker. Chomsky's notion of competence contrasted with that of performance, or socially situated language use, with all that the real-time production of utterances implies: false starts, interruptions, grammatical inaccuracies, slips of tongue, word searches, etc. As an imperfect representation of language, performance, according to Chomsky, lacked scientific interest. Parallels can be drawn between Chomsky's notion of competence and the Saussurian reference to *langue*, and Chomsky's performance and Saussure's *parole*.

While Chomsky's concern for innate language knowledge –linguistic competence– continues to be shared by many researchers and language professionals, the 1960s and 1970s witnessed the development of approaches to language and language competences which foreground social context. On the one hand, the British linguistic tradition had long been interested in social context in its descriptions of human linguistic behavior. Following the work carried out by John Rupert Firth since the 1930s, Michael Halliday (1961) founded systemic-functional linguistics. This approach to linguistics takes into account structural aspects of language, while focusing first and foremost on its pragmatic function –that is, on the functions carried out through language and on the linguistic mechanisms for the achievement of such actions. In this sense, considering the social context and the situated appropriateness of language use is relevant, since it determines the meaning potential of a particular utterance, and hence a language user's capacity to produce social action by employing particular linguistic resources. Concurrently, on the European continent there was a need to respond to the language learning needs of a growing migrant population, which led the Council of Europe to develop curricula based on communicative functions, inspired by systemic functional linguistics, thus promoting a performance-driven understanding of competence.

Certainly the most important development, however, took place in the United States during the same period of time. There, anthropologist Dell Hymes (1966) formulated a transcendental critique of the notion of competence as formulated by Chomsky. Hymes challenged the disregard of performance, and proposed that what should really claim scientific interest is what he referred to as communicative competence. This competence is intrinsically related to the sociocultural context and the communicative rules of communities, and includes the set of skills that a person must possess in order to communicate in socially appropriate ways. Hymes' (1972) proposed the SPEAKING model as a heuristic for identifying aspects of a communicative event influencing what it means to communicate competently in context. The model starts with the setting and scene (S), understood as both the physical time and place of a communicative event, as well as consideration of what basic interactional encounter is taking place. Secondly, the model refers to the participants (P), including the speaker and interlocutors. The model follows by taking into account the ends (E), including participants' goal-directed

orientations, and any pre-determined social or institutional objectives of an event. It further recognizes the overall sequential, topical and turn-taking organization of the event (referred to as act sequence, hence the A) as a feature of context. Key (K) is also included, taking account of the tone, manner or spirit of an event, including the different stances that participants can take up and have to interpret when communicating with others. So too are the available instrumentalities (I) or communicative modes (speaking, writing, etc.) and resources (languages, registers, etc.) available to participants, considered in the model. The context of a communicative event also includes certain norms (N) for producing and interpreting speech acts. Finally, the model takes account of the discursive activity or genre (G).

Hymes' notion of communicative competence became extremely influential in research on second and foreign language acquisition from the 1970s, where it was developed further. This was due in large part to the work of Michael Canale and Merrill Swain (1980), who operationalized communicative competence by defining four interrelated sub-competencies that constituted it: grammatical, discursive, sociolinguistic and strategic. Grammatical competence, similar to Chomsky's linguistic competence, refers to the knowledge allowing users to construct and interpret grammatically correct utterances. Discursive competence refers to the ability to produce and understand cohesive and coherent utterances. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the capacity to adapt language use to the social context. Strategic competence describes the way users compensate for communicative problems.

Since these sub-competences were proposed, other descriptions of communicative competence have also been suggested. The most relevant of these is included in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001, 2018). According to this framework, communicative competence includes linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic sub-competences. Linguistic competence includes lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonological, orthographic and orthoepic sub-competences. Sociolinguistic competence encompasses linguistic markers of social relations, politeness conventions, expressions of folk wisdom, register differences, and aspects related to dialect and accent. Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to organize, structure and arrange discourse, to enact communicative functions and to design communication according to interactional schemata.

More recently, social interaction is being afforded more and more centrality in theories of language knowledge and use, and the notion of interactional competence has been proposed as a development from communicative competence. This term was introduced in the late 1980s by Claire Kramsch. Interactional competence is defined as the constellation of resources and knowledge about the social world that unfolds when communicating with other people, in mutually coordinated actions. In interactional competence, the co-responsibility of social actions is emphasized, beyond the communicative competence of individuals. Interactional competence also requires looking beyond verbal communication, to multimodal repertoires.

SEE ALSO:
iela0351
iela0049

Moore, E. (2020). Competence, linguistic and interactional. In J. Stanlaw (ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0070

iela0160
iela0360

References and Further Reading

Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1): 1-47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21236/ad0616323

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Halliday, Michael. 1961. "Categories of the Theory of Grammar." *Word,* 17(3): 241-292. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1961.11659756

Hymes, Dell H. 1966. "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity." In *Sociolinguistics*, edited by William Bright, 114-158. The Hague: Mouton. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110856507-009

Hymes, Dell H. 1972. "Models of Interaction of Language and Social Life." In *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, edited by John J. Gumperz, and Dell H. Hymes, 35-71. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Kramsch, Claire. 1986. "From Language Proficiency to Interactional Competence." *The Modern Language Journal*, 70: 366-72. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05291.x